

# State Epidemiology Outcomes Workgroup

January 4, 2007 9-11 a.m. DSAMH Rm. 314

**Members in Attendance**: Ed Ho, Angela Smart, Tricia Winder, Brenda Ahlemann, Craig PoVey, Steve Harrison, Susannah Burt, Verne Larsen, Jeff Smart, Christy Porucznik, Barbara Sullivan

**Members Excused:** 

#### **Minutes**

#### **Welcome & Introductions**

**Agenda Item: Review of Minutes** 

**Motion:** Christy Porucznik motioned to approve the minutes from 12/7/06. Ed Ho seconded the motion and was unanimously approved.

#### Non-Agenda Item:

- Verne brought school district data to add to the current data that has been collected.
- ➤ The SEOW is invited to participate in a Prevention Coordinator meeting on Wednesday, February 7, 2007 to introduce the SPF and present SEOW Epi Profile Report.
- ➤ Barbara Sullivan suggested presenting the Epi Report to UBHN.
- ➤ Barbara also suggested giving the Epi Profile information to Mary Kay Huntsman.

### Agenda Item: SEOW Maryland Meeting- Binders available/online

➤ If you haven't received a binder, there are several still available.

#### **Agenda Item: Reports – Monthly Charter**

➤ All reports are up to date.

# **Agenda Item: Contract Update**

- ➤ Bach Harrison won the bid for the SEOW consultant.
- ➤ We are in the process of putting together the RFP for the SPF SIG Evaluator.

## Agenda Item: State Epi Profile

- Christy reviewed the Epi Draft Profile Report.
- > Steve suggested adding a page that defines the headings of each chart.
- ➤ Barbara substituting the word "change" to "impact" in the column heading "Ability to Change through Intervention."
- Angela suggested making reference to evidence-based practices within the column.
- Craig reminded the group that the target audience should be kept in mind when making decisions about report content.
- > Steve and Craig suggested, and then the workgroup decided, to leave the entire column (Ability to Change through Intervention) out of the chart.
- Craig suggested that the group start to look at data gaps, and which data is most important to collect.
- Ed suggested that the next important step is prioritization; geographic (by LSAA?), by age, gender, etc...
- > Steve suggested that we follow national data collection trends in order to be consistent and comparable.
- > Steve suggested collecting at the lowest level possible (county) and then rolling up to the LSAA if not available.
- ➤ It was decided that the report provide data at the LSAA level, but that county level data continue to be collected.

## **Agenda Item: SEDS Database**

Please take a look at this site if you have not already done so.

Next Meeting: Thursday, February 1, 2007, 9-11am DSAMH Rm. 314